



Bay Area Regional ITS Plan Stakeholder Workshop Survey March 12, 2007

1. Have you ever used the Bay Area Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Plan or Regional ITS Architecture?

14 YES

17 NO

1 YES and NO (Yes, through East Bay Corridors; No, in terms of City projects)

2. How did you use it?

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Planning Purposes</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Look at where a project fits in terms of Regional ITS Architecture▪ For federal earmark
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>System Development & Design Purposes</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Regional ITS Arch was used for Transit 511 subsystem development▪ To Prepare SERF & will do for SEMP▪ Finding system requirements▪ Used to test and analyze Smart Corridors software
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Reference Purposes</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Distributing to managers of various IS projects to show how regional standardization is important▪ Reference

3. How can the Bay Area ITS Plan be improved to make it more accessible or useful?

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>General Comments</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Plan should provide goals and a vision for the Bay Area▪ Cultivate MTC's roles as a regional repository/resource for ITS implementation▪ Systems must strive to be standardized
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Training Suggestions</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Training to familiarize Bay Area ITS plan▪ More illustrations on how the architecture would be useful to me – less perception.▪ More well planned training or website for more pertinent agencies
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Enhancement Suggestions</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Provide a repository for APIs for the different subsystems



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Make the plan interactive (filter, sort, etc by Agency, category, project) ■ Software may need some standards, to make it possible for different agencies to be more interactive ■ Provide expert advisor available to clients when needed ■ Provide workshops in the sub-regions (i.e. South Bay County Area)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Website-related Suggestions</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Links to free resources ■ On line accessible ■ Make the plan interactive (filter, sort, etc by Agency, category, project) ■ Needs to be more futuristic to be a roadmap for ITS community

4. What is your opinion of the logistics for today's workshop?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>General Comments</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Not sure that there was enough participation to make the workshop worth while ■ It was adaptive to what people wanted to talk about ■ Good brain storming and exchange of data ■ Interaction was good, but still unclear how this fits together at a higher/strategic level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Meeting Format Suggestions</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ May have been better to have as two workshops – one for policy and the other to discuss actual projects ■ Adding projects to display boards ■ Need more instruction with defined goals
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Suggestions regarding ITS Architecture</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Needed more definitions of the architecture – shouldn't assume everyone totally understands ITS basics. ■ Maybe more explanations of the architecture ■ Longer, more in depth look at the smart corridor and the center/program of architecture ■ The ITS initiative was rather broad and the first thing is to get a high level view/summary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Short Answers</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Very effective ■ Excellent ■ Ok ■ No comment



5. Is there anything you would change about the communications you received prior to the workshop?

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Notification Suggestions</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">■ A reminder to visit website for updated information■ Earlier notification on registering■ Keep informed on progress – email; contact agency to make sure that the information was received.■ A more detailed agenda■ Would have liked to know more what was going to be discussed so I could be better prepared.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>ITS Architecture Suggestions</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">■ More explanation on how the ITS Architecture should be used■ A few more concrete examples of projects and how they interface■ What other regions are doing■ Seeing other region's plans
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Enhancement Suggestions</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Training added to the next meeting to see we are all here■ A link to the existing plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Comments</i><ul style="list-style-type: none">■ The time frame for the meeting was too limited to allow true detailed discussion■ Only one point of contact – received too many calls prior to first meeting■ Letter to upper management about efforts (carrot & stick)

Conclusion

The Stakeholder Workshop Survey implies the Bay Area ITS Plan is underutilized by stakeholders. Those that are using the Plan are using it for planning purposes and for Systems Engineering analysis, but the majority of ITS stakeholders are not using it because it is not accessible or because they don't understand how or why. The stakeholders suggested an interactive plan that spells out exactly how and why to use the Plan.